



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/812,484

03/29/2004

Bruce Ahrens

018360/270566

3252

826

7590

03/05/2009

ALSTON & BIRD LLP

BANK OF AMERICA PLAZA

101 SOUTH TRYON STREET, SUITE 4000

CHARLOTTE, NC 28280-4000

EXAMINER

ROBERTSON, DAVID

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2121

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/05/2009

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/812,484	Applicant(s) AHRENS ET AL.	
	Examiner Dave Robertson	Art Unit 2121	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 November 2008.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 77-78, 80-83, 87, and 88 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 77-78, 80-83, 87, and 88 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>1/8/09</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This is a Final office action in response to Applicant's reply of 11/20/2008.

Claims 77-78, 80-83, 87, and 88 are pending.

Response to Amendment

2. Applicant amends claims 77, 81, and 82 to more clearly recite displaying job methods on first and second screen window... to clarify that job methods may be displayed in two *areas* of a display of a portable computer device. Accordingly, the rejections under 35 U.S.C 112, 2nd paragraph, are withdrawn.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 77-78, 80-83, 87, and 88 have been considered but they are not persuasive:

Applicant argues over Richardson (US Pat. 5,867,823) as applied to independent claims 77 and 81, that Richardson cannot not teach or suggest *displaying on a portable device, a screen window...said screen window displaying a plurality of job methods to be performed*, because Richardson instead "provides a screen and a number of keys (icons) that indicate an activity to be performed" (Remarks, pg. 8 , top) and that whereas Richardson's device which provides the worker instructions and guidance for the activity, it does not do so with a *screen window displaying a plurality of job methods to be performed*. (Remarks, pg. 8, 2nd paragraph).

However, while the *preferred* embodiment of Richardson's portable computer device (Figure 2) for displaying job methods and activities to a user has one display and a set of icons, Richardson teaches or suggests other embodiments and other devices having similar form and function (see column 3, line 41). The *icon* display of activities on the face of the device with job methods and instructions in the first display (12) serve as a "window" or display depicting "job methods" (sweeping, cleaning, inspecting, spill clean up,...) which may, suitably implemented on a portable computer with "window" capabilities as is known in the art (see e.g. Ryan US Pat. 6,871,195 as previously cited), teaching or suggesting *displaying on a portable device, a screen window...said screen window displaying a plurality of job methods to be performed.*

Applicant also calls attention to a citation in the rejection of an element of claim 77 (Remarks, pg. 8, 2nd paragraph). However, Applicant misreads the intent of the citation. Having determined (for the claims as previously filed) a teaching for the *screen window displaying a plurality of job methods to be performed* in the limitation prior, the citation to "column 5 from line 42" addressed (as Applicant points out), the producing of an audible sound or message on the display when the time limit for performance of task expires, with explanation as to why this teaches *indicating that said second measurement exceeds a predetermined threshold and altering a display of said job method..*

Applicant is reminded that citation to passages are provided for the convenience of the Applicant whereas Applicant is further advised to consider the cited prior art in its entirety in response to any particular teaching relied upon.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

5. Claims 77-78 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Richardson (US Pat. No. 5,867,823).

Specifically, with respect to the claims presented:

Claim 77

Richardson teaches *a portable device for recording and evaluating a subordinate's work, comprising a user interface for receiving information, an information storage device, a screen device for displaying information; and a processor coupled to said user interface, said information storage device, and said screen device (see Figure 1 and column 2 from line 57); said processor configured for storing, on said portable device data associated with a plurality of job elements wherein each said plurality of job elements comprises a set of job methods to be performed by a subordinate over the course of a work session (see column 2 from line 29, inter alia); displaying on said portable device, a screen window associated with a first of said job elements, said screen window displaying a plurality of job methods to be performed by said subordinate, said particular set of job methods corresponding to said first job element*

Art Unit: 2121

(see column 3 from line 39 to column 4 line 42)); *receiving input comprising a measurement indicating that said subordinate has failed to comply with at least one job method of said particular set plurality of job methods (see column 4 line 26); and responsive to said input indicating that said measurement exceeds a predetermined threshold for said at least one job method, altering a said display of said at least one job method on said screen window wherein said screen window comprises a concurrent display of said particular set of job methods (see column 5 from line 42: using Richardson as fully described for the application of supermarket or other retail center maintenance, producing an audible sound and producing a message on the display when the time limit of two hours for the performance of the regular maintenance tasks expires).*

Claim 78

Richardson teaches *wherein said data stored on said portable device further comprises written descriptions of said particular set of job methods (see column 3 from line 49).*

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

6. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

7. Claims 81-83 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson (US Pat. No. 5,867,823).

Claim 81 recites a method performing steps corresponding to the functions claimed for the device of claim 77, and is similarly rejected as explained above for claim 77, over the respective functional teachings of Richardson; however, Richardson does not expressly teach performing the method twice on a portable device capable of displaying two windows.

Claim 81 recites performing steps for using the portable device: *displaying*, *receiving* input, and *indicating* measurements of job methods on a *first* window (see 112(2) above for interpretation taken for first and second “screens”) for a *first* job at a *first* work location, then performing the steps a second time *displaying*, *receiving*, and *indicating* on a *second* window for a *second* job at a *second* job location. There is no apparent distinction between the performing of the first set of steps for the first job method and the performing of the second set of identical steps for a second job method other than display of the first and second job methods in first and second windows.

Mere duplication of parts has no patentable significance unless a new and unexpected result is produced. *In re Harza*, 274 F.2d 669, 124 USPQ 378 (CCPA

1960). Analogously, mere repetition of steps or a set of steps, as in the present case, that produces no new or unexpected result, is not patentably significant in view of a teaching for performing the method once. See MPEP 2144.04 VI (B).

In the present case, the invention performs the same method twice on a device capable of displaying two windows at once. Official Notice is taken that portable computing devices, which include equivalents to the general portable device of Richardson (see column 2 from line 57, of which the device of Figure 1 is *exemplary*) such as portable “tablet” computers, may be easily configured to display first and second windows running the same process or program performing substantially the same method *twice*. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to perform the first iteration of the method of claim 81 corresponding to the functionality of claim 77, and then perform the method a second time in a second window. Such a capability would have been within the ordinary skill in the art and would have been recognized as mere duplication or repetition, each iteration resulting predictably as performing each iteration separately.

Claim 82

Richardson teaches or suggests the method of claim 81 as above, and further *selecting a job method on the first screen window and responsive to selection of the selected job method, storing an indication that said subordinate the worker failed to comply with the selected job method* (see column 4 from line 20).

Claim 83

Richardson teaches *wherein the step of storing data includes storing written descriptions of each job method of the first and second sets of job methods* (see column 3 from line 49: storage of job method instructions is necessarily inherent in the ability to display written instructions).

8. Claims 80, 87, and 88 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Richardson as applied above to claim 77, and further in view of Hoshino (US Pat. 6,073,062).

Claims 80, 87 and 88

Richardson teaches claim 77 as above; however, Richardson does not teach *wherein said input is received from a sensor positioned on a vehicle used by said subordinate during said work session* or that the sensor provides input from the group consisting of *door data, global positioning data, engine data, weather data, ignition data, and mileage*, or that such sensor input is received *wirelessly*.

Hoshino expressly teaches in the art of monitoring drivers of vehicles, e.g. delivery truck drivers, speed monitoring (from a sensor) of a vehicle (a truck) input to a portable (mobile) device configured for receiving, displaying, and monitoring work instructions as in the art of Richardson and the present invention. Hoshino teaches sensors providing monitoring of potentially “wrong use” of transportation vehicles (see Background and column 2 at line 62). Richardson teaches confirming compliance with safety instructions by requiring the worker to provide input to questions (see column 4

from line 26). Richardson also teaches using the portable device for monitoring the workers' location (column 4 from line 5) as a step in ensuring the worker is at the proper location for the task assigned.

As Hoshino expressly teaches that automated monitoring of drivers following safety instructions is improved by using sensors signaling vehicle speed automatically to the portable device, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to provide such inputs to the portable device of Richardson, as this would have ensured reliability in the monitoring of a safety compliance instruction *maintain safe speed* in a in-vehicle application of task instruction and monitoring, as well as the attendant advantages of automating inputs to verify compliance.

As to the particular vehicle data sensed and receiving sensor input wirelessly, Hoshino expressly teaches sensing global positioning information wirelessly (column 8 from line 26) to ensure proper location of the vehicle according to driver instructions. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention, that sensing position *wirelessly* (GPS) would have provided additional verification to the *location* of the worker in the application of Richardson to vehicle-based task monitoring and instruction, as doing so would have provided additional, automated verification that the worker is performing the tasks assigned according to instructions provided, such as *proceed to [next] location* thereby ensuring that vehicle-based tasks are properly performed and recorded.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Dave Robertson whose telephone number is (571)272-8220. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 am to 6 pm, M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Albert Decady can be reached on (571) 272-3819. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Albert DeCady/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art
Unit 2121

/Dave Robertson/
Examiner, Art Unit 2121